

Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/776,202		GARNER, HAROLD R.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	BJ Forman		1634	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) BJ Forman. (3) Monique VanderMullen.
 (2) Thomas Wright. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 22 November 2002.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant requested information regarding progressing toward an interference against the Gao patent cited in the Office Action. The examiner informed Applicant that first, Applicant's claims must be in condition for allowance; second, Applicant's claims must overlap with those of Gao and a declaration must be submitted regarding the date of reduction to practice of the instant invention. The examiner stated that the instantly claimed invention does not conflict with the invention of Gao because the Gao patent is drawn to a method while the instantly claimed invention is drawn to a device..